27th March 1929]

(h) Yes. Officers of the I.A.S. have to pass in one vernacular and officers of the M.A.S. in two vernaculars. A knowledge of the vernacular is essential for officers who have to be in touch with ryots.

Proposed transfer of the Livestock section to the Veterinary department.

* 1988 Q.—Mr. R. Nagan Gowda: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to transfer the cattle-breeding work from the farms attached to the Livestock section of the Agricultural department to the Veterinary department and, if so, for what reason?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (a) of question No. 1987 given to-day.

Opening of an Agricultural demonstration farm in Tiruvallur taluk.

* 1989 Q.—Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a petition was sent to the Department of Agriculture by the ryots of Thandumetta and other villages in the Tiruvallur taluk, Chingleput district, for the opening of an agricultural demonstration farm;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Director of Agriculture promised to open the farm after a road to the extent of 7 or 8 miles between Kannigapperu and Vengal via Thandumetta is laid out;

(c) whether it is a fact that the road referred to in (b) has been sanctioned by the Tiruvallur Taluk Board three years ago;

(d) whether it is a fact that the construction of the road has not so far been taken up;

(e) whether the Government are aware that the delay in constructing the road has been due to the political differences between the villagers concerned and the president of the taluk board; and

(f) whether the Government will consider the desirability of advising the Department of Agriculture to open the agricultural demonstration farm without waiting further for the construction of the road?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) The Deputy Director had under consideration a suggestion for opening a demonstration area in the village but gave it up subsequently as there was no road to the place and because the contemplated demonstration would not be of benefit to the public.

(c), (d) & (e) The Government have no information.

(f) No. Our limited resources in men and money can be better expended elsewhere where we are likely to benefit a greater number of people.

Co-operative Societies

Alleged differences among the members of the Nilakkottai Co-operative Union.

*1990 Q.—Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in the Nilakkottai Co-operative Union, Madura district, comprising Kovilpatti, Ettiapatti, Kilakovilpatti, Kombaipatti, Karattupatti and 35 other villages differences have arisen between the president and members of the co-operative union;

[27th March 1929

(b) whether it is a fact that in protest against the action of the president in not calling for a meeting, 21 members out of 40 sent a written requisition for convening a meeting and, in consequence of the failure of the president to comply with their request, convened two meetings on their own initiative;

(c) whether it is a fact that the president of the union attended both those meetings but for a short time;

(d) whether it is a fact that the president of the said union is still employing in service a dismissed supervisor and whether the dismissed supervisor is closely related to him;

(e) whether it is a fact that a deputation consisting of the members of the said union waited on the Registrar of Co-operative Societies at Madura and requested him to give the union another president; and

(f) what steps have been taken to enquire into the grievances of the members and to improve the affairs of the Nilakkottai Co-operative Union?

A.—(a) Differences arose among the members of the governing body elected at the general body meeting held on 13th November 1927 after a period of six months.

(b) A requisition from 21 members calling for a meeting was sent to the governing body which met on 11th May 1928 and out of six members present at that meeting three insisted on convening a meeting while the other three opposed them. No decision was reached but the meeting was not summoned, and the three members who were for convening a meeting sent out notices calling for a general meeting and held a meeting on 27th May 1928. A second meeting was again convened by them on the same date and hour, viz., 9th September 1928, when a general meeting was convened by the regular governing body at the instance of the Assistant Registrar who had been present to effect a compromise.

(c) No information is available on this point.

(d) The supervisor was removed from service by the governing body of the union on 3rd September 1927 and on appeal the general body reinstated him at their meeting held on 13th November 1927. The supervisor is related to the president.

(e) The deputation was to have met the Registrar at Madura but did not do so. The Registrar arranged to meet the union and went to Nilakkottai but on account of Dipavali no members of the governing body appeared.

(f) The Assistant Registrar settled the dispute and has given a decision under rule XIV of the rules which, however, is questioned. The Deputy Registrar is enquiring into the matter and the Registrar hopes to meet them and settle the question.

Representation of Muslims in the Co-operative department.

* 1991 Q.—Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that out of 65 senior inspectors and 460 junior inspectors in the Co-operative department there are only 3 and 14 Muslims respectively who hold such appointments;